DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 267 517 EA 018 345

AUTHOR Mueller, Ernest H.
TITLE The Oak Park Plan: The Fourth "R" (Rescheduling).
PUB DATE Mar 85
NOTE 24p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Association of School Administrators (Dallas, TX, March 8-11, 1985).
PUB TYPE Reports - Descriptive (141) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Class Organization; Classroom Techniques; Class Size; *Educational Strategies; Elementary Education; Individual Instruction; Integrated Activities; Mainstreaming; Principals; Remedial Instruction; Resource Teachers; *Scheduling; *School Personnel; Special Education; *Staff Development; *Student Placement
IDENTIFIERS Oak Park School District IL

ABSTRACT

The Oak Park Plan, implemented in the Oak Park (Illinois) School District, was a 2-year (1983-85) project designed to correct four perceived problems: (1) low achievement levels in math for 40 percent of the students; (2) ineffective remedial instruction; (3) declining enrollment requiring an adjustment in personnel resources and service levels; and (4) a changing population requiring an adjustment in expectations and instructional methods. The Fourth "R" (Rescheduling) program restructured the use of existing personnel to reduce class size. The focus of remediation was altered to focus on continuous progress based on appropriate knowledge levels, pace of instruction, and enhanced expectations. The classroom teacher was reinstated as the person responsible for core academic instruction; pullouts and other interferences to core instructional time were eliminated. The changes were all made at no cost or minimal cost, and two independent researchers verified the effectiveness of the plan. Ongoing opportunities for staff development and the efforts of the principals and directors of instruction to improve teacher effectiveness are important for continued success of the Oak Park Plan. Fifteen references are attached. (GJ)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED267517

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Ernest H. Mueller

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

THE OAK PARK PLAN

THE FOURTH "R"

(RESCHEDULING)

By: Ernest H. Mueller
Superintendent of Schools
Oak Park Elementary District #97
Oak Park, Illinois

Appreciation is given for the assistance of Dr. Elsie Harley, Associate Superintendent, and Howard Hawkinson, principal of the Fourth "R" school, for the collection of data.

EA 016 345

March 1985

THE OAK PARK PLAN

THE FOURTH "R"

(RESCHEDULING)

THE PROBLEM:

Our traditional or historical approaches to public school education and resource utilization were no longer producing the quality or quantity of outcomes suggested possible in the current research. Program and staff competency adjustments were needed to improve teaching strategies and student outcomes.

The Nation

The current spate of national reports in which the sorry state of our existing education process was incessantly proclaimed was considered by some as evidence of an impending national disaster. The innuendo contained in these reports was that unless something dramatic was done the eventual demise of public education could be that disaster.

Oak Park District #97

The conditions described in the national reports did not, however, accurately portray the state of education in Oak Park District #97. The differences were that Oak Park had a population of high performing students, allocated funds for education and expended them at a rate well above the national average, and had a staff and community dedicated to the maintenance of a quality education system.

On the surface, the preceding conditions suggested that Oak Park did not fit the national reports and that its educational affairs were well in order. A more critical look revealed the following:

A) Based on norm referenced test data, Oak Park students had an average mean score of 75% in reading and an average mean score of 60% in math. The discrepancy between the reading and math scores would indicate that Oak Park was performing below its expected level in math. The fact was

that approximately 40% of Oak Park children performed below the 50th percentile in math. This indicated that our high achievers performed quite well, but that a high percentage of "low ability" students were not performing well at all.

B) Oak Park also had a historical commitment to the provision of extensive services to those in need of special education. During past years, 18% or more of the total student population had been categorized, tested, and labeled for some area of special education.

Year	Total Enrollment	Number in Special Education	Percent
1981-82	4820	897	18.6%
1982-83	4799	759	15.8%
1983-84	4740	620	13.1%

The special education, reading, and other remedial programs operated on a pullout basis under the premise that these children were best served by removing them from the normative classroom, placing them with a specialist, fixing them up, and then returning them to the regular classroom. The problem with special area programs such as LD resource rooms (LDR), remedial reading, speech, and others, has been that the removal from the regular classroom (pullouts) and fix-up/return process worked for very few. Indeed, with 18% of the total population identified and labeled special education, perhaps the reverse was true. The indications were that the remedial programs were a self-perpetuating condition conducted in an atmosphere not transferable to the regular classroom. After years of treatment, few children were delabeled and certified as operationally able to perform on their own in the regular classroom. Evidence of the magnitude of the pullout problem is indicated in the following statement of District #97's Director of Special Education:

> "Since 1979 there has been research which indicates that increasing the capabilities of the regular school environment to meet the needs of individual students results in greater student gains academically, personally and socially than removing a student from the regular classroom environment to a different environment for a portion of the student's day. The "pullout, fixup and return to the regular classroom" theory of learning seems to have failed when the students did not return to that regular classroom able to evidence the ability to learn within that regular classroom. If one adds up the time (30 minutes daily) that a student might spend with the resource teacher, removed from the classroom experiences of his/her peers, in one school year of 176 days, one finds the student has missed 88 hours of classroom instruction and exposure to curriculum covered in the regular classroom in which they are expected to function." Oliver (1985, p.1.)

C) As District #97 student enrollment declined from 6,308 in 1975-76 to approximately 4,650 in 1984-85, a corresponding need to adjust personnel resources and service levels in small schools with 350 pupils to comparable levels in larger schools of 500 to 700 pupils occurred.

D) Also evolving in District 97 was a population with changing needs which required an adjustment in expectation levels, instructional grouping, pace of instruction, and the need for education to reinforce the positive self-image of every child.

With the foregoing as examples of needs in Oak Park, an approach to assist in overcoming our shortfall in these areas was required.

The Oak Park Plan, the Fourth "R" (Rescheduling), restructured the use of existing personnel to reduce class size to approximately 15 to 1, altered the focus of remediation to one of continuous progress based on appropriate challenge levels, pace of instruction and enhanced expectations, and reinstated the classroom teacher as the person responsible for core academic instruction with no pullouts or interferences to the core instructional time, all at no cost or minimal cost.

Rescheduling Personnel Resources for Improvement of Instruction

The following comments are legendary in the field of teaching and indicate the futility many teachers feel regarding the lack of opportunity to manage their classrooms:

"If only I didn't have so many students, I could do a better job."

"If only I had a little more time with Johnny, I could have pulled him through the work."

"I have so many class interruptions I have no time to teach."

"I have so many different groups in my class that I can't spend enough time with any one group."

"When I teach to the whole class, my pace and level of instruction miss both ends."

Exclusive of economic considerations, the desire for small class sizes and their perceived (conflicting research notwithstanding) corresponding academic opportunities has been historically promoted and sought after by teachers and parents.

Additionally, student "pullout" from regular instruction for special area instruction (art, music, physical education, plus others) and for remedial instruction in reading, special education and speech, has traditionally been an irritant to regular classroom teachers because of its disruption of instructional continuity and the corresponding loss of student achievement.

The goal, then, was to improve student outcomes. The approach employed was to lower class size, minimize class interruptions, increase time on task, reduce discipline problems, strive to limit the number of instructional levels to two per classroom, and mainstream students formerly removed from the regular classroom, without a corresponding massive economic impact.

Factors Relative to the Design and Implementation of the Fourth "R"

An analysis of existing staff availability and scheduling options was undertaken and a set of criteria for determining the efficacy of any plan to be considered and a time line for implementation were developed:

1. Cost Effectiveness of Program

2. Inservice Program for Staff

3. Evaluation Design

4. Contract Compliance/Concerns

5. Implication for the District

6. Implementation

   A. Phase-in and move to districtwide implementation if and when feasible.

7. Timeline

   November/December

   A. Identify buildings with available space.
   B. Identify administrator willing to support program.
   C. Determine existence of required staff competencies.
   D. Produce an operational schedule.
   E. Clear up contract implications.

   January through March

   A. Obtain staff commitment.
   B. Resolution of special area teacher concerns
   C. Obtain support of teachers' association.
   D. Produce final schedules.
   E. Make staff adjustments.
   F. Introduce program qualities to parents.
   G. Obtain parental assistance and program support.

8. The factors which would support the undertaking of such a reallocation of personnel resources.

   A. The major factor for improving student outcomes, academic and social, is the relationship between student and teacher.

      1) Improved teacher attitudes.
      2) Reduced class size.
      3) Individual has control of time management.
      4) Increased teacher time with students.
      5) Increased student time on task.
      6) Reduced pullout.
      7) Reduced class disruptions.
      8) Locate teacher responsiblity for student outcomes with a specific teacher.
      9) Reduced tendency to label students and to turn them over to others for outcomes.
      10) Reduced frequency of student discipline problems and student actions which require external control and remediation.

11) Increased opporunity for mainstreaming of special education students.
12) Increased opportunity for the inclusion of new instructional areas such as computer-assisted instruction, gifted/talented at grade levels 1 through 6, and potential for increased time in other special areas such as ongoing inservice for teachers.

The Final Design Structure of the Fourth "R"

The design which was implemented was based on research documentation of the effectiveness of service delivery, within the regular classroom, to students considered to be in need of remediation and upon the research in the area of effective instruction. Consequently, the total structure of programs of remediation and the use of these staff members (LDR and reading teachers) was altered to one of continuous progress in the regular classroom, consultation, and direct services. Media teachers were also to be incorporated into regular classroom instruction. (The inclusion of the media teacher as a part-time core academic teacher was determined in prior years due to declining enrollment and a desire to maintain jobs for the media people.) The design provided for the use of these teachers, along with all regular classroom teachers, to be scheduled to teach a class of approximately fifteen students each in the core academic subjects (reading, math, language arts) during a non-interrupted block of three hours of time. During the balance of the day (2½ hours), all remaining subject areas would be taught at the regular class size of approximately twenty-five students to one teacher. Special education and other remedial specialists, plus media, would provide direct service opportunities, consultative teacher services, and other appropriate student services during the remaining 2½ hours of the day.

The resulting schedule provided for a substantial reduction in class size for the teaching of the core academic subject areas, a reduction of the number of different instructional levels to two, a solid block of uninterrupted instructional time, and a recombining of students to full, regular class size during the teaching of the special subject areas, with no or minimal increase in costs.

The rescheduling design is particularly unique because it modifies what has traditionally become the means for improving student outcomes: removing children from the mainstream of instruction and increased resources and use of specialists for remediation of low achieving students.

The significance of the design is seen in the total departure from the current trend of applying more and more resources to specialists to fix children.

Rescheduling makes the assumption that the regular classroom teacher is responsible for all core subject instruction. This renewed faith in the value of the regular classroom teacher is accompanied by reduced class sizes which increase the chances for improved stduent oucomes within the regular classroom.

A radical difference in the rescheduled classroom is the manner in which the specialist is utilized. The specialist is not disposed of but is retained as a member of the regular classroom teaching team. These specialists function as classroom teachers during the three hour uninterrupted block of time (Fourth "R" program), and provide teacher consultation or direct student services during the balance of the day (2½ hrs.) in the area in which he/she has specialized.

The logic inherent in making this adjustment is based on the fact that the amount of time allocated to instruction for the classroom teacher is approximately four times the amount allocated to the specialist. With class sizes reduced, classroom teachers may accept the responsibility to instruct all children in their classes and they might also develop the belief that they can make a difference. If these conditions materialize, student outcomes should be dramatically affected.

In addition to the preceding attributes, a full time cross-graded core academic gifted and talented program was made available at each grade level, 1st through 6th, at a fifteen to one pupil/teacher ratio. The fifteen to one gifted program operated during the morning and during the afternoon (at a twenty-five to one pupil/teacher ratio) the program was open to children who did not qualify academically for the morning core gifted/talented academic program.

The requisites to the accomplishment of this type of design were: the availability of adequate classroom space to house the additional smaller classes; the availability of an adequate number and variety of dually certified special area and classroom teachers; and above all, principal, teacher, parent, school board acceptance. Implementation of the program included the time and opportunity for inservice work for all staff to make certain that the teaching strategies employed by teachers were those which were best suited for smaller class sizes and for the special needs of children who were mainstreamed. The existing staff also was allowed the time to develop additional certification without the threat of job loss. New staff were evaluated with a special interest in those with dual teaching certification. In addition, the school board was to give assurance that increases in staff/student ratios above seventeen to one at a grade level would not be allowed to occur during the Fourth "R" time.

With the accomplishment of the preceding listed requirements and the approval by the board of the implementation of the Fourth "R" program, a professional research expert was employed by the district to conduct an evaluation of the Fourth "R". The researcher's description of the program is as follows:

"In their interest to increase the achievement of Oak Park elementary students, the District #97 Board and administration adopted the propositions that: (1) Learning is a function of the uses of instructional time; and that (2) Modifying the school day to increase instructional time should lead to gains in learning. They believed, in addition, that the success of any plan for reconfiguring the school day was dependent upon its ownership by those who would live with it. In consequence, they invited principals and teachers to submit building-level plans for re-allocating the hours of instruction. The term chosen to describe the re-allocation was rescheduling."

"Part of the idea of rescheduling was to carve out uninterruptable blocks of instructional time and, within these blocks, to reduce class size. Under the traditional system, specialized personnel (e.g., music teachers, speech correctionists, and so on) pull students from classes throughout the day. A student receiving a special service may thus, for instance, be absent from one reading class each week. Under rescheduling, students would receive several hours of instruction in core subjects during one segment of the day, and none would be excused for support or enrichment activities."

"In effect, this prohibition against pullouts meant that, during the core segment, a rescheduled school acquired more teachers at no added cost because the specialists were free to be re-assigned. The students could therefore be distributed across more teachers, with a resulting drop in class size. During the remaining hours of the day, the school would return to the traditional program, and students would leave classrooms for special services or lessons."

"It is important to stress that no school's rescheduling plan would receive approval unless its architects could demonstrate that the changes were supported by the staff and by the parents. Parents were to be given full opportunity to understand, debate, and foreclose on or ratify the proposed program."

"Finally, it was intended that, under rescheduling, teachers would change their methods of instruction. Smaller classes would permit the formation of fewer within-class instructional groups, and pupils would therefore have more frequent contact with teachers."

Staff Levels Before and During the Fourth "R" Program

The following staff chart is an example of the actual staffing schedule and pupil/teacher ratio of one Fourth "R" school before the Fourth "R" and during it.

Grades 1-6 Enrollment	1982-83 REGULAR SCHEDULE 304		1983-84 FOURTH "R" IMPLEMENTED 280			1984-85 FOURTH "R" 2ND YEAR 309		
	AM / PM Pullouts all day		AM No Pullouts	PM Pullouts	FTE	AM No Pullouts	PM Pullouts	FTE
Grades 1-6 Classroom Teachers	12.0		12.0	12.0	12	11.0	11.0	11
Teacher allocated (Not employed in 1982)	1.0		.5 .5	0 0	1	.5 .5	0 0	1
LD Resource	.6	(add .4)	.5	.5	1	.5	.5	1
Media (Part teaching (Part Media	1.0		.5	.5	1	.5	.5	1
LD	1.0		.5	.5	1	.5	.5	1
Reading	.8	(add .2)	.5	.5	1	.5	.5	1
Gifted	.5	(add .5)	.5	.5	1	.5	.5	1
Regular Classroom Sections Pupil/Teacher Ratio	13 23.4/1		19 14.7/1			18 17/1		
Full Time Equivalent Staff	16.9				18			17
Special Area Staff	4.7*				4.7*			4.7*
TOTAL Full Time Equivalent Staff	21.6				22.7			21.7
Difference in Staff Totals 1982 - 1983 - 1984					+ 1.1			+ .1

*Does not include Chapter I

Cost Effectiveness

The staff increases, between the 1982 year when the traditional staff schedule was in place and the 1983 and 1984 school years when the FOurth "R" schedule was in place, were 1.1 staff FTE for 1983 and only a .1 FTE increase over 1982 levels for 1984. Along with the staff changes was an increase in program options. The gifted program became a full time program by adding 1/2 staff at the Fourth "R" school. The reading (by adding .2 staff) and the resource room (by adding .4 staff) also became full time teachers at the Fourth "R" school. The increases in reading and LDR staff were consistent with staff levels found in all other district non-Fourth "R" schools of an enrollment size similar to that of the Fourth "R" school.

The 1984 Fourth "R" program, at the Fourth "R" school previously described, contained adjustments which reduced staff from the 1983 levels and the actual staff costs were almost the same as the pre-Fourth "R" of 1982 for this specific school.

Another variable also is at work in the area of staffing levels and this is the fact that class size variations often are more or less favorable for balancing in some years. Consequently, cross-grading to balance class sizes can work quite effectively in some years and less effectively in others, thereby necessitating less or more staff. With six schools operating on the Fourth "R" program during 1984, with a total grade 1-6 enrollment of 2181 pupils, the combined staff increase for all Fourth "R" programs was 3.1 Full Time Equivalents.

Staff Development

In addition to the changes created by the adjusted use of personnel in the Fourth "R" program, a staff development effort was also initiated. One element of the original 1983 staff development program was to assist special education and regular classroom teachers in the development of effective teaching strategies

for special education children and for other children. A second staff development effort also was undertaken in the area of staff use of student test data for the purpose of focusing and driving instruction at the child's appropriate challenge level.

The staff development efforts were conducted by consultants, building and central office administrators and by peer-teacher presenters.

The utilization of test data to focus and to drive instruction was based on the belief that if each child was placed at the appropriate level of instruction, instructional time could be more effectively used.

In this way, when subject or task mastery was obtained. the child could be moved to a new task without additional time spent on a mastered topic. Likewise, if the task was too difficult, adjustments could be made to make teaching and learning more productive. This effort was undertaken in both the math and reading areas but was only completed in the math area.

In the second year of the Fourth "R" program (1984) additional efforts at staff development were taken. During a week long summer program the building principals and directors of instruction participated in a seminar on effective administration and effective teaching. In the fall, a two day follow-up of this program also was conducted. This was in preparation of the anticipated successful conclusion of board/teacher contract negotiations over the assignment of weekly staff development periods. It also was in preparation for the building principals and the directors of instruction to take on their new roles as staff developers. All of this effort was directed toward the production of effective teaching. The negotiation of the weekly staff development time met with a lot of resistance from teachers, but this gradually diminished after implementation.

As a result of negotiations, an hour on Tuesdays and an hour and a half on Thursdays are available for staff development. The focus of the program was effective teaching strategies and complemented the need for new strategies with the smaller class sizes. The staff development program is in its formative stages but offers a tremendous potential for improved programs and improved student outcomes. The program contains several components, such as peer inservice, external consultative inservice, and administrator-directed inservice.

Outcomes Realized from the First Year of the Fourth "R"

Selected Teacher Responses to the Fourth "R"
(Obtained from the research consultant's report)

A) "No one had any discipline problems, and most offered small classes as the reason. One attributed the class's good behavior to her being 'so involved' with them that she was 'on top of any problem immediately.' Another said that discipline was improved because the 'kids are busy,' while a third teacher thought that a combination of a small class in a large space made the difference."

B) "Several teachers first dodged this question (In your view, did the students learn more?) by saying that they had no 'hard evidence' to support their response. Beyond that, however, only one teacher said she could not tell. The remainder were solidly agreed that they had covered more material. One said she had been better able to spot and correct learning deficiencies. Another had 'more time for problem areas.' Combined grade teachers concurred. A fourth grade teacher found that 'students become better students in a smaller class. They want to learn more, and they accept more responsibility.' Both surveyed second grade teachers focused their replies on the slower

students: 'Even the less intellectually able students covered more material without any problem.' 'The kids did beautifully. I was able to get the ones that would have been lost in previous years.' "

C) "Only two teachers reported a negative effect to the question, 'How has rescheduling affected your morale---your attitude toward teaching?' One said, 'It is not easy with a split grade.' Two others found no change, one because she always loved teaching and still does. The rest were delighted. Several praised the cooperation with colleagues that arose with rescheduling. In the words of one teacher: 'The whole school atmosphere is one of academic purpose. All the teachers are happy to work together.' Another teacher said she 'worked harder, but didn't feel wrung out: everyone shared ideas.' One colleague 'felt I could put myself into teaching,' and another said, 'The end of '83 was an all-time low, and the end of '84 is an all-time high.' "

Academic Outcomes

(From the research consultant's report)

"Direct assessment of learning gains brought about by rescheduling is difficult. Too little time has passed for conclusive, objective evidence to be available. Nevertheless, some indication of accelerated achievement may be inferred on the basis of the results of the mathematics criterion-referenced testing that took place during fall and spring--- grades 2-6.

"Table 6 reports the percentages of Fourth "R" students who showed mastery of mathematics objectives in the fall and in the spring. The third column reports the gain." (*) Note

Table 6

Percentages of Students Showing Fall and Spring Mastery of Mathematics Objectives 2nd through 6th Graders in the Fourth "R" School

Grade	Fall	Spring	Gain
2	61	91	30
3	43	80	37
4	47	74	27
5	16	82	66
6	28	63	35
AVERAGE	39	78	39

(*) Note: The results are the product of 2nd grade math being taught during the small group rescheduled time with 45 minutes of uninterrupted instruction and the 3rd-6th grade math being taught during the regular class size (25-1) with no interruptions and 45 minutes to 1 hour 15 minutes of instruction.

Student Rate of Absenteeism

While the traditional rate of student absenteeism at the Fourth "R" school has been quite low, the rate of absenteeism for the period from August to March of the implementation of the rescheduling program dropped 21%. The actual average rate of absenteeism went from 4.2 in 1982-83 to 3.3 in 1983-84. Wick (1984, p.12)

Special Education

During the first year of the Fourth "R" a selected group of LD students and an LD teacher were included in the program. Some of the LD students attended the regular core academic classes for one-half of the day with 10 or 12 regular students (total pupil/teacher ratio 15-1), taught by a regular classroom teacher. Other LD students remained with the LD teacher whose class now contained 10 to 12 regular students. The LD

teacher taught all core academic subjects to all students during this half day period. During the remaining half day, the LD teacher provided direct LD services to those children who required it and provided consultative services to the regular classroom teachers.

With the advent of the second year of the Fourth "R" program (1984-85) came the inclusion of the LDR teacher into the Fourth "R" program. Along with the LD teacher the LDR teacher taught the core academic areas for half a day to a mixed group of special education students and regular students in a class size of approximately 15 to 1, and then provided direct services to students along with consultative services to teachers as needed during the other half of the day. To augment direct instruction to LDR students in the regular classroom, special consideration was given to the employment of regular classroom teachers who had dual certification in LD. While this action did not increase staff totals, it did increase the number of staff with LD credentials.

During the two years (1983-84, 1984-85) of the Fourth "R" program's existence, the labeling of LDR children dropped from a total of 280 students during 1982-83 to 211 in 1983-84, and to 169 in 1984-85. The drop in labeling reflects the implementation of a new set of exit and entrance criteria which occurred during the 1982-83 school year and the implementation of the Fourth "R" in six district schools during the 1984-85 school year.

It is too early to provide test data results for special education students, but LD students' comments from the first year's implementation of the Fourth "R" in one school provide some limited evidence of student attitude:

> "I like being mixed in with the regular kids. The other kids in the school do not call us names any more.... I like being in a class with normal kids instead of all LD kids. I think the teachers are doing an outstanding job of teaching me this year.....They have been so patient with my learning disability."

> "I love being in the room with the regular kids in the morning."

The LD and LDR teacher staffing levels remained unchanged during this reduction in student labeling. In addition to the normal levels of LD and LDR teachers, some new teachers who were employed during the second year of the Fourth "R" program also had LD and LDR certification along with their K-6 certification. This provided even greater opportunity for LDR children to receive instruction appropriate to their need without removal from their regular classrooms with a 15-1 pupil/teacher ratio.

SUMMARY

After one year of analysis of the Fourth "R" Program (Rescheduling), the research consultant made the following observations and findings:

> "...the concept of rescheduling, which requires a reasonably substantial amount of planning and effort to implement, was put in place for all the students and teachers of one Oak Park school. A pilot program of implementation has been successfully completed, and, if the data warrant expansion, a template for others to follow is in place.
>
> "...the predictable sharp increase in total minutes of instruction was realized. Using 1982-3 as a base, the total minutes of instruction increased about 40% at the Fourth "R" school.
>
> "...given the sharply larger number of minutes of instruction for a reasonably constant number of students, a construct estimating teacher availability for individual attention (Weekly Pupil-Teacher Access Units, or PTAU) also showed a similar sharp increase at the Fourth "R" school.
>
> "...using an available measure of achievement in math, the Fourth "R" pupils did appear to profit academically from the experience. However, more time needs to pass, and more data need to be brought to bear on the issue before any definitive conclusions can be drawn.
>
> "...absenteeism at the Fourth "R" showed a 20% decline.
>
> "...in general, teacher attitude toward rescheduling, after one year, is positive."

During the second year of the Fourth "R" program, a second researcher, Annagret Harnischfeger, made the following observations:

" Rescheduling has reduced the student/teacher ratio for the specified time block.

"This has increased the teacher/student contact time which research found to be positively related to student achievement via an increase in active learning time or time-on-task. Learning and behavior problems can be addressed more readily and individual feedback and correctives can be given more often.

" Rescheduling has reduced the subgrouping at least in 'Language Arts'

"The fewer subgroups there are in classrooms, the less seatwork needs to occur. Since the amount of seatwork has been found to be negatively related to student achievement, reducing the need for subgrouping would likely result in higher student achievement.

" Rescheduling has reduced interruptions

"Since there are no pullouts during the rescheduled time block fewer interruptions of the teaching-learning process occur. Activities can be completed by all students.

" Rescheduling allows successful mainstreaming

"Classes are small enough to allow teachers to attend to certain learning difficulties effectively. Mainstreamed students benefit academically and in self-esteem from the 'typical' reference group. Actually, I saw during my classroom visits a student with identified learning problems turn from a slow to a fast learner.

"With Rescheduling Oak Park has made a commitment to increase student achievement. Resources have been reallocated in promising ways. The frame is set. Let's move ahead!" Harnischfeger (1985, pp.3-4)

CONCLUSIONS

If the Fourth "R" program is to continue to realize its initial evidence of success, the staff strategies for handling each child's appropriate level and pace of instruction must be enhanced. Consequently, the ongoing opportunity for staff development and the efforts of the principals and directors of instruction to improve teacher effectiveness must also be continued. The concerns of LDR, reading, and media teachers regarding the changes in their roles and the changes in the structure of remedial programs also require continued attention.

The Fourth "R" is a sound vehicle for generating staff interest and enthusiasm in improved teaching effectiveness. (Now, the ways to accomplish this feat must be made more widely available and must be documented.)

###

References

American Association of School Administrators, Time on Task, Arlington, VA.: AASA, 1982

Corcoran, T.B. and Hansen, B.J., The Quest for Excellence - Making Public Schools More Effective, New Jersey School Board's Association, 1983.

Educational Research Service, Effective Schools: A Summary of Research, Arlington, VA.: ERS, 1984.

Greer, J. and Wethered, C., "Learned Helplessness: A Piece of the Burnout Puzzle." Exceptional Children, April 1984, 50(6), 524-529.

Haight, S., "Special Education Teacher Consultant: Idealism Versus Realism." Exceptional Children, April 1984, 50(6), 507-515.

Harnischfeger, A. "Rescheduling: A Promising Route to Increasing Student Achievement." School of Education, Northwestern University, January 1985.

Karwiet, N., Time on Task: A research Review. Center for Social Organization of Schools, Johns Hopkins University, January 1983.

Lewis, R.B., "Learning Disabilities and Reading: Instructional Recommendations from Current Research." Exceptional Children, November 1983, 50(3), 230-240.

Madden, N.A. and Slavin, R.E., Count Me In: Academic Achievement and Social Outcomes of Mainstreaming Children With Mild Academic Handicaps, Center for Social Organization of Schools, Johns Hopkins University, October 1982,

Oliver, S., "District 97 Learning Disabilities Resource Program 1979-80 Through 1984-85." Unpublished, Oak Park, IL, February 1985.

Roddy, E.A., "When Are Resource Rooms Going to Share in the Declining Enrollment Trend? Another Look at Mainstreaming." Learning Disabilities, 17(5), May 1984.

Wang, M.C. "The Adaptive Learning Environments Model." Learning Research and Development Center, University of Pittsburgh, March 1984.

Wang, M.C. and Birch, J.W., "Effective Special Education in Regular Classes." Exceptional Children, February 1984, 391-398.

Wang, M.C. and Birch, J.W., "Comparison of a Full-Time Mainstreaming Program and a Resource Room Approach." Exceptional Children, September 1984, 33-40.

Wang, M.C, Vaughan, E.D. and Dytman, J.A., "Staff Development: A Key Ingredient of Effective Mainstreaming." TEACHING Exceptional Children, Winter 1985, 112-121.